

PISANELLI BICE  
400 SOUTH 7TH STREET, SUITE 300  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101

James J. Pisanelli, Bar No. 4027  
Debra L. Spinelli, Bar No. 9695  
M. Magali Mercera, Bar No. 11742  
PISANELLI BICE PLLC  
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
Telephone: 702.214.2100  
Facsimile: 702.214.2101  
Email: [jjp@pisanellibice.com](mailto:jjp@pisanellibice.com)  
Email: [dls@pisanellibice.com](mailto:dls@pisanellibice.com)  
Email: [mmm@pisanellibice.com](mailto:mmm@pisanellibice.com)

Jonathan D. Polkes (admitted pro hac vice)  
Stephen A. Radin (admitted pro hac vice)  
Caroline Hickey Zalka (admitted pro hac vice)  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, New York 10153  
Telephone: 212.310.8770  
Facsimile: 212.310.8007  
Email: [jonathan.polkes@weil.com](mailto:jonathan.polkes@weil.com)  
Email: [stephen.radin@weil.com](mailto:stephen.radin@weil.com)  
Email: [caroline.zalka@weil.com](mailto:caroline.zalka@weil.com)

Attorneys for Defendants Georges Antoun,  
Kevin DeNuccio, Sarita James, Jay Leupp,  
Merrick D. Okamoto, Said Ouissal, Simeon  
Salzman, and Fred Thiel, and Nominal Defendant  
Marathon Digital Holdings, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

KIMBERLY BERNARD, Derivatively on Behalf of  
MARATHON DIGITAL HOLDINGS, INC. (f/k/a  
MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC.),

Plaintiff,

v.

FRED THIEL, GEORGES ANTOUN, KEVIN  
DENUCCIO, SARITA JAMES, JAY LEUPP,  
SAID OUISSAL, MERRICK D. OKAMOTO, and  
SIMEON SALZMAN,

Defendants,

-and-

MARATHON DIGITAL HOLDINGS, INC. (f/k/a  
MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC.),

Nominal Defendant.

Case No.: 2:22-cv-00305-RFB-NJK

**RESPONSE TO MOTION (ECF  
NOS. 34, 35, AND 36) TO  
CONSOLIDATE, APPOINT LEAD  
COUNSEL, AND INDEFINITELY  
STAY MAY 31, 2022 DEADLINE TO  
RESPOND TO MOTIONS TO  
DISMISS**

ROY STRASSMAN, Derivatively on Behalf of  
MARATHON DIGITAL HOLDINGS, INC. (f/k/a  
MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC.),

Plaintiff,

v.

FRED THIEL, GEORGES ANTOUN, KEVIN  
DENUCCIO, SARITA JAMES, JAY LEUPP,  
SAID OUISSAL, MERRICK D. OKAMOTO, and  
SIMEON SALZMAN,

Defendants,

-and-

MARATHON DIGITAL HOLDINGS, INC. (f/k/a  
MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC.),

Nominal Defendant.

Case No.: 2:22-cv-00724-ART-EJY

**RESPONSE TO MOTION (ECF  
NOS. 19, 20) TO CONSOLIDATE,  
APPOINT LEAD COUNSEL, AND  
INDEFINITELY STAY MAY 25,  
2022 DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO  
MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

## PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

These are almost word-for-word identical shareholder derivative actions in which plaintiffs purport to sue eight individuals on behalf of Nominal Defendant Marathon Digital Holdings, Inc. (“Marathon”). The lawsuit besmirches the names of these eight individuals, alleging that they breached their fiduciary duties as directors and officers of Marathon. The claims are meritless. Among other things, Nev. Rev. Stat. § 78.138(7) requires that a claim against a director or officer of a Nevada corporation allege “intentional misconduct, fraud or a knowing violation of law.” No intentional misconduct, fraud, or knowing violation of law is alleged in plaintiffs’ complaints.

Marathon and Defendants are entitled to have their motions to dismiss heard. Plaintiffs have had Defendants’ moving papers since April 4, 2022. On April 18, 2022, the Court set a deadline for a response in the *Bernard* action: May 31, 2022. The Local Rules require a response in the *Strassman* action on May 25, 2022; that date has passed. Marathon and Defendants offered the plaintiff in the *Strassman* action an extension until May 31, so that the two near-identical complaints could be briefed in one rather than two rounds of briefing. Plaintiffs rejected that offer.

Instead, plaintiffs seek – and appear to have granted themselves – indefinite extensions of time. In plaintiffs’ world, the filing of two near-identical complaints (instead of the usual practice, one complaint with two plaintiffs) entitles plaintiffs to an indefinite time to file a formal

1 consolidated complaint and exempts them from complying with court deadlines for responses to  
2 motions to dismiss. Upon learning of plaintiffs' position, Marathon and Defendants offered to  
3 stipulate to consolidation with a deadline for filing a consolidated complaint. Plaintiffs refused to  
4 stipulate or propose a deadline. Plaintiffs instead filed multiple motions for the obvious purpose  
5 of delay: stipulations take days; briefing and decisions on motions take months.

6 Today is May 27, 2022. If plaintiffs need a short amount of time beyond the May 31, 2022  
7 deadline to commit to dates for a consolidated complaint addressing the deficiencies in plaintiffs'  
8 current complaints and briefing a new motion to dismiss, they need only ask. Marathon and  
9 Defendants will extend plaintiffs' counsel every reasonable professional courtesy – but not the  
10 many weeks plaintiffs seek by moving for consolidation rather than stipulating to consolidation.

11 If plaintiffs choose to default in the hope that the Court will retroactively extend deadlines,  
12 then the Court should dismiss plaintiffs' actions with prejudice to plaintiffs re-filing new actions  
13 asserting the claims asserted here in this Court or any other Court. If the Court chooses to forgive  
14 plaintiffs' default, the Court should order that plaintiffs file a consolidated complaint within seven  
15 (7) days of the Court's Order and respond to any renewed motion to dismiss within twenty-one  
16 (21) days of the filing of the renewed motion.

### 17 STATEMENT OF FACTS AND ARGUMENT

18 On February 18, 2022, plaintiff Kimberly Bernard commenced Case No. 2:22-cv-305-  
19 RFB-NJK. ECF No. 1. On March 25, 2022, service was effectuated. ECF No. 6. On April 4, 2022,  
20 Marathon and Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the *Bernard* action. ECF No. 11. Plaintiff  
21 Bernard requested two months to oppose the motion to dismiss, and the parties stipulated to a May  
22 31, 2022 due date for plaintiff's opposition. ECF No. 18. On April 18, 2022, the Court so ordered  
23 the schedule. ECF No. 26.

24 On May 5, 2022, plaintiff Roy Strassman commenced Case No. 2:22-cv-724-ART-EJY.  
25 ECF No. 1. Plaintiff Strassman's complaint copied, nearly word-for-word, the entirety of the com-  
26 plaint filed by Plaintiff Bernard, as follows, ignoring the deficiencies identified in the motion to  
27 dismiss the *Bernard* complaint filed on April 4, 2022:  
28

Bernard Compl. ¶	Strassman Compl. ¶	Bernard Compl. ¶	Strassman Compl. ¶	Bernard Compl. ¶	Strassman Compl. ¶	Bernard Compl. ¶	Strassman Compl. ¶
1	1	24	24	47	47	70	73
2	2	25	25	48	48	71	74
3	3	26	26	49	49	72	75
4	4	27	27	50	50	73	76
5	5	28	28	51	51	74	77
6	6	29	29	52	52	75	78
7	7	30	30	53	55	76	79
8	8	31	31	54	56	77	80
9	9	32	32	55	57	78	81
10	10	33	33	56	58	79	82
11	11	34	34	57	59	80	83
12	12	35	35	58	60	81	84
13	13	36	36	59	61	82	85
14	14	37	37	60	63	83	86
15	15	38	38	61	64	84	87
16	16	39	39	62	65	85	88
17	17	40	40	63	66	86	89
18	18	41	41	64	67	87	90
19	19	42	42	65	68	88	91
20	20	43	43	66	69	89	92
21	21	44	44	67	70	90	93
22	22	45	45	68	71	91	94
23	23	46	46	69	72	92	95

The *Strassman* complaint made just four changes to the *Bernard* complaint: (1) the *Strassman* complaint double-spaces rather than single-spaces block quotes; (2) the *Strassman* complaint replaces female gender pronouns for the plaintiff with male gender pronouns; (3) the *Strassman* complaint corrects a typo (the *Bernard* complaint stated in paragraph 60 that “the Company Board was comprised of eight (6) members,” while the *Strassman* complaint replaces “eight (6) members” with “six (6) members”); and (4) the *Strassman* complaint skips paragraph numbers 53, 54, and 62 in its numbering of paragraphs, resulting in a 95 paragraph complaint rather than a 92 paragraph complaint.

On May 11, 2022, Marathon and Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the *Strassman* action on the same grounds that Marathon and Defendants moved to dismiss the *Bernard* action. *Strassman* ECF No. 11. On May 17, 2022, the undersigned counsel proposed briefing the identical motion to dismiss on the same schedule the Court ordered in the *Bernard* action. Radin Decl. ¶ 3. On May 18, 2022, plaintiffs’ counsel informed the undersigned counsel that plaintiffs intended to move to consolidate the cases and file a consolidated complaint before briefing the pending motions to dismiss. The undersigned counsel offered to stipulate to consolidation and asked

1 plaintiff's counsel to propose a date for the filing of the consolidated complaint. *Id.* ¶ 4.

2 Plaintiff's counsel declined to stipulate or propose a date. *Id.* Instead, on May 23, 2022,  
3 plaintiffs filed multiple motions. The motions seek (1) consolidation – to which Marathon and  
4 Defendants had offered to stipulate, (2) a “Co-Lead Derivative Counsel” stamp of approval by the  
5 Court – completely unnecessary but something to which Marathon and Defendants would have  
6 stipulated to if asked, and (3) the only contested subject of the motions – a stay postponing the  
7 deadlines set in the Court's April 18, 2022 Order, indefinitely. *Bernard* ECF No. 34, 35, and 36;  
8 *Strassman* ECF No. 19, 20.

9 Marathon and Defendants oppose the indefinite stay plaintiffs seek and appear to have  
10 granted themselves notwithstanding the Court's April 18, 2022 Order. Counsel for the plaintiffs in  
11 the two actions admit that “from the inception of the litigation” they have been “coordinating  
12 together.” *Bernard* ECF No. 34 at 3; *Strassman* ECF No. 20 at 2. Plaintiffs do not explain why  
13 two plaintiffs “coordinating together” chose to file a second near-identical complaint a month after  
14 a motion to dismiss their first complaint had been filed, rather than opposing the motion to dismiss  
15 or addressing deficiencies in their new complaint. Plaintiffs do not explain why the drafting of a  
16 consolidated complaint combining two near-identical complaints would require more than an hour  
17 or two of work by any one of the four law firms representing plaintiffs.

18 Deadlines in Court Orders should be enforced. If plaintiffs choose to oppose the pending  
19 motions to dismiss with a consolidated complaint addressing the deficiencies in plaintiffs' existing  
20 complaints, they may do so on May 31, 2022 – the date the Court so ordered on April 18, 2022.  
21 Marathon and Defendants will promptly respond to any such consolidated complaint. If plaintiffs  
22 need a short amount of additional time to oppose the pending motions to dismiss plaintiffs' two  
23 complaints, or commit to a date for a consolidated complaint curing the deficiencies in plaintiffs'  
24 first two complaints, Marathon and Defendants will extend every reasonable professional courtesy.  
25 But if plaintiffs choose to default in the hope that the Court will extend the deadlines plaintiffs  
26 have chosen to ignore, then the Court should dismiss plaintiffs' actions with prejudice to plaintiffs  
27 re-filing new actions asserting the claims asserted here in this Court or any other Court. If the  
28 Court chooses to forgive plaintiffs' default, the Court should order, as stated above, that plaintiffs

1 file a consolidated complaint within seven (7) days of the Court's Order and respond to any  
2 renewed motion to dismiss within twenty-one (21) days of the filing of the motion.

3 **CONCLUSION**

4 For all of these reasons, Marathon and Defendants oppose plaintiffs' motion to indefinitely  
5 extend the deadlines set in this Court's April 18, 2022 Order and request that the Court dismiss  
6 plaintiffs' actions with prejudice to plaintiffs re-filing new actions asserting the claims asserted  
7 here in this Court or any other Court, or, if the Court chooses to forgive plaintiffs' default, the  
8 alternative relief stated above.

9 DATED this 27th day of May 2022.

10 PISANELLI BICE PLLC

11 By: /s/ M. Magali Mercera

12 James J. Pisanelli, Bar No. 4027

13 Debra L. Spinelli, Bar No. 9695

14 M. Magali Mercera, Bar No. 11742

400 South 7th Street, Suite 300

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

15 -and-

16 Jonathan D. Polkes (admitted pro hac vice)

17 Stephen A. Radin (admitted pro hac vice)

Caroline Hickey Zalka (admitted pro hac vice)

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

767 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10153

19 Attorneys for Defendants Georges Antoun, Kevin  
20 DeNuccio, Sarita James, Jay Leupp, Merrick D.  
21 Okamoto, Said Ouissal, Simeon Salzman, and Fred  
22 Thiel, and Nominal Defendant Marathon Digital  
23 Holdings, Inc.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on this 27th day of May 2022, I caused to be served via the Court's CM/ECF program true and correct copies of the above and foregoing **RESPONSE TO MOTION (ECF NO. 34, 35, AND 36) TO CONSOLIDATE, APPOINT LEAD COUNSEL, AND INDEFINITELY STAY MAY 31, 2022 DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO MOTIONS TO DISMISS** in the *Bernard* action and **RESPONSE TO MOTIONS (ECF NOS. 19, 20) TO CONSOLIDATE, APPOINT LEAD COUNSEL, AND INDEFINITELY STAY MAY 25, 2022 DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO MOTIONS TO DISMISS** in the *Strassman* action to all parties via electronic service.

/s/ Cinda Towne

An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC

PISANELLI BICE  
400 SOUTH 7TH STREET, SUITE 300  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101